

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Scott Conzelmann,)	Civil Action No.: 6:21-522-BHH
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
Warden, Butner Federal Medical Center,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

Scott Conzelmann ("Petitioner") filed a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for initial review.

On March 24, 2021, Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald filed a Report and Recommendation ("Report") outlining the issues and recommending that the Court transfer the petition to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina. Attached to the Report was a notice advising Petitioner of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the

Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge that this action should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 9) and transfers this petition to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

May 11, 2021
Charleston, South Carolina